

Appl. No. 10/706,740  
Response to Office Action of February 23, 2006  
Page 6

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 23 2006

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully responds to the Office Action mailed on February 23, 2006.

#### Rejection under 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112 second paragraph. As shown in the Amendments to Claims, independent Claim 1 has been amended to delete the term "cylindrical." Applicant believes the amendment to Claim 1 will overcome this rejection to Claims 1-6 because claims 2-6 are all dependent from Claim 1.

#### Claims 1 and 13

Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. Both of these claims has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Chari (USPN 5,076,302) in view of Sanchez Cordero (USPN 4,428,389). As shown in the Amendments to Claims, Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include ribs along the interior of the protrusion. Such ribs provide for better mating with a toothpaste tube cap, among other benefits. This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Chari or Sanchez Cordero, either individually or in combination. Applicant believes this amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection and places Claims 1 and 13 in condition for allowance.

#### Claim 7

Independent Claim 7 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Chari (USPN 5,076,302) in view of Sanchez Cordero (USPN 4,428,389). As shown in the Amendments to Claims, Claim 7 has been amended to provide ribs along the interior portion of the upstanding walls forming the protrusion. Such ribs provide for better mating with a toothpaste tube cap, among other benefits. This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Chari or Sanchez Cordero, either individually or in combination. Applicant believes this amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection and places Claim 7 in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/706,740  
Response to Office Action of February 23, 2006  
Page 7

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-17

Claims 2-6 are dependent from Claim 1, Claims 8-12 are dependent from Claim 7 and Claims 14-17 are dependent from Claim 13. Applicant believes that, due to the above described amendments to the independent claims, all of these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 18-20

Claims 18-20 have been added as new claims and are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

Appl. No. 10/706,740  
Response to Office Action of February 23, 2006  
Page 8

### CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the undersigned respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20 and issuance of a patent containing these claims in due course.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call Wab Kadaba at (404) 532-6959.

Respectfully submitted,



Vaibhav P. Kadaba  
Registration No. 45,865

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
Suite 2800  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
(404) 815-6500  
Attorney Docket No.: 38949/280375